

Employment Act to authorize private law suits against state violators. A case raising a similar issue with respect to the Americans with Disabilities Act is sure to follow. And if the Court says no, private individuals who suffer age, disability, and other forms of discrimination at the hands of state actors will have few means at their disposal to enforce their rights under federal law, and the federal government will rarely be able to help them.

The Court left open the possibility that the federal government could sue noncompliant states, but if you think that it is realistic for the federal government to come to the rescue by going into court on a regular basis to vindicate the federal rights of private individuals, think again. I do not see a massive expansion of the federal litigating corps happening any time soon. Nor do I see how that could be anything but self-defeating if the goal is to minimize the federal intrusion into state government affairs. By elevating the states' sovereign immunity to an immutable principle of constitutional law, the Court, as Justice Breyer recognized in his *College Savings Bank* dissent: "makes it more difficult for Congress to decentralize governmental decisionmaking and to provide individual citizens, or local communities, with a variety of enforcement powers. By diminishing congressional flexibility to do so, the Court makes it somewhat more difficult to satisfy modern federalism's more important liberty-protecting needs. In this sense, it is counter-productive."

Now don't get me wrong. Sometimes the federal and state governments do not get their relationship quite right. We do not have infallible institutions. But when the Supreme Court restricts the flexibility of Congress to decide how best to address national problems within the scope of its enumerated powers, the Court truncates the learning process otherwise underway in our political institutions—a result a conservative court—conservative with a small "c"—should hesitate to effect.

The Court has imposed by fiat limitations on the exercise of federal power that might very well have come about without the Court's interference. In other words, the Court in *Garcia v. San Antonio Metropolitan Transit Authority* got it right when, in 1985, it overruled *National League of Cities v. Usery*, a case decided a decade earlier, that had restricted the federal government's power to regulate the states "in areas of traditional governmental functions." Instead, the Court announced in *Garcia* that the political process, not the Court, should serve as the principal check on federal overreaching. I must disagree with the notion that leaving it to Congress and the President is like leaving the fox to guard the chicken coop, or as Justice O'Connor put it in her dissent in *Garcia*, like leaving the "essentials of state sovereignty" to Congress' "underdeveloped capacity for self-restraint."

The Violence Against Women Act civil rights remedy is a good example of Congress' developing capacity for self-restraint. At the outset, those most concerned about domestic violence and rape wanted a statute with a broad sweep, and so we started out by introducing a provision in 1990 that arguably would have federalized a significant portion of state laws against domestic violence and rape. But the Conference of Chief Justices of State Supreme Courts, the Judicial Conference of the United States—and Chief Justice Rehnquist, in particular—pointed out to Congress, while the bill was under consideration, that the civil rights provision might significantly interfere with the states' handling of domestic relations and rape cases, while at the same time, overburdening the federal courts. The federal and state judi-

ciaries raised the concern, we examined it, and we decided that they were right. Congress then carefully redrafted the civil rights remedy so that it would not have that effect.

There are other recent examples—such as the Unfunded Mandates Act—that came about because the states complained to Congress that we were forcing them to use their tax dollars to do whatever we mandated in Washington. The states staged a mini-rebellion. So Congress wrote a new law requiring federal restraint. And for that, I must give my Republican colleagues their due.

But when the Supreme Court plays traffic cop on the streets of federalism, the Court does our country a disservice by cutting this national political dialogue short. We are already reaching many of the conclusions the Court has now cemented into the Constitution. James Madison wrote in the *Federalist Papers* that the new federal government would be sufficiently national and local in spirit as "to be disinclined to invade the rights of the individual States, or the prerogatives of their governments." Our political institutions can be trusted. The Framers understood this.

In short, the disconnect between our public and cultural perceptions of our institutions and reality is stunning. Keep in mind that the rest of the world is struggling to emulate our institutions because they believe it is our institutions that separate us from other nations—indeed, from other democracies—and are the bedrock upon which our successes are founded.

Yet our public discourse, our legal opinions, our very culture, are compelling us to overlook or scorn our own accomplishments. We are losing, as a nation, the communal notion that our strength lies in our institutions. Relentlessly accentuating the negative when it comes to our political institutions, however, eclipses our considerable successes. And this predilection to distrust the political branches now seems to be shared equally by the judicial branch, not only when it comes time to decide how to distribute power between the federal government and the states, but also when it comes to making a judgment of what is in the best interests of Americans.

I talked to you tonight about cynicism, devolution of power, and how we got here. In my view, all of that can be overcome by the right leadership, the right people in power, who will recharge the public's imagination and confidence. The public mood can be transformed in an election, a single cycle. Maybe it will take a generation. But it can be changed. Elected officials who cater too much or too little to state interests can be voted out of office. But if the Supreme Court chisels into stone new constitutional restrictions on federal power, new hoops through which Congress must leap, where will we be then? You cannot go to the polls to undo a constitutional ruling of the Supreme Court. There is no further appeal—no appeal to a higher court, no appeal to the voters. Nothing short of a new constitutional convention or an amendment to the Constitution—and you know how easy that is—or will do. James Madison was right: trust the political process. "WE CANNOT AGREE"? Please.

Let me conclude by making the following simple point: if, at the federal level, we are such a failure institutionally, why does the rest of the world look to us to copy our supposed frailties? If we are such a failure—with our last six Presidents supposedly flops—how is that our incomes are actually growing, crime is going down, drug use is down, and our economy is in better shape than that of any nation in the history of the world? How did we produce a nation willing and able, as the President of Bulgaria pointed out, to spend billions of dollars and risk the lives of

its men and women to advance the cause of human rights? Did it happen by chance? Did it happen by accident? It happened as a direct result of our unique political institutions.

The Framers set out to create a centralized government robust enough to deal with national problems, but with built-in guarantees that it be respectful of, and sensitive to, local concerns. There is an inherent tension in the document. But look at the sweep of history: as the balance of power has shifted back and forth between the national government and the states, our resilient political branches have adjusted and responded. The rest of the world gets it.

We must remember that politics—and politicians—are not the enemy. The Constitutional Convention was composed of men who were regarded as gifted even in their own day. As the French charge d'affaires wrote to his government as the Convention convened:

If all the delegates named for this Convention at Philadelphia are present, we will never have seen, even in Europe, an assembly more respectable for the talents, knowledge, disinterestedness, and patriotism of those who compose it.

Above all else, these men were politicians. And I am not suggesting by this that our government today boasts the likes of a Jefferson or a Madison, but I am suggesting that we have fine and decent men and women with significant capabilities who choose public service. And some of you are among them.

The hostility we see from the Supreme Court toward the elected branches of government is the same suspicion we see in the eyes of the ordinary person on the street. "Politics" has become a dirty word. But as those of you here who live in this state of strong local community governments and town hall meetings, know better than anyone, "politics" is fundamental to how we govern ourselves in a democracy. At the end of the day, politics is the only way a community can govern itself and realize its goals without the sword.

So I stand before you today, on this 212th anniversary of the completion of the work of the Constitutional Convention, ready and willing to defend politics—even national politics. It was what those 50 gentlemen, all strangers, who met 212 years ago defended and vindicated. And it is what, in the end, has made and will continue to make us secure and strong.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume consideration of S. 2521, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2521) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. The ranking member of this committee has some chores to do. I am finding no one on the floor who wants to talk on this piece of legislation, unless the Senator from Delaware wants to make his Kosovo statement.

Mr. BIDEN. I will do whatever the Senator would like me to do.

Mr. BURNS. I tell the Senator, I have a feeling we are not going to really get into the meat of this bill until after the policy luncheons.

If the Senator would like to open it up, say, with your statement at around 2:15, we might be able to arrange that. Until then, I would put the Senate back into morning business.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I would be happy to do that. But would I be able to appropriately ask unanimous consent that I be recognized first, unless the managers wish to be recognized, when we reconvene after our party caucuses?

Mr. BURNS. Let's hold up for a minute until we get some consultation.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, let me rephrase that. I ask unanimous consent that after the managers and/or either party leader I be recognized to make my statement on Kosovo.

Mr. BURNS. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BURNS. I thank my good friend from Delaware.

Mr. President, seeing no one to speak on this issue—and I think most everybody is awaiting the debate for this afternoon—I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of morning business until 12:30 p.m. today and that Senators be permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE DISASTER IN NEW MEXICO

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I note on the floor with me this afternoon is Senator BINGAMAN. We are both here to speak about the disaster and catastrophe that has occurred in New Mexico. I would like to speak maybe for 5 or 6 minutes, then yield to my colleague, and then come back and do a little more.

During my time in the Senate, which is now approaching 28 years, I vividly remember coming down and hearing Senators have to tell the Senate about a disaster of significant proportions in their home State. The Senator wanted to tell us about how bad things were and lay the groundwork for the Congress, the Government of the United States, to do what it must to help those who are victims in a disaster.

To tell you the truth, I have been to Los Alamos, oh, so many times over the last 28 years. Most of them have been very joyous occasions, when we met with some of the greatest scientists in the world, talked about some fantastic science, met some wonderful people, and saw a beautiful town up there in the mountains. It came into being when the United States of America decided a former boys' academy up there in the mountains would be the center around which we would develop our first atomic weapons. It was a closed city for a long time but a beautiful place.

Sure enough, never did I expect to see what I saw last Thursday when Senator BINGAMAN and I, the Secretary of Energy, and James Lee Witt, the head of our emergency disaster relief agency for the United States, and others flew out there. Then we helicoptered around. Then we drove the streets to see what was occurring.

Senator BINGAMAN took a little different tour than I. He saw some of the housing. I saw where they set up the headquarters to manage and operate things. So he will have some very vivid recollections of what he saw, of houses burned to the ground.

Essentially, it is, indeed, a very sad day when probably one of the greatest laboratories human beings have ever set up—in terms of great science, not just because of great buildings but because great scientists have lived there and worked—is surrounded by flames. Many people supported those most talented of Americans—and even some of our greatest friends from other countries have been there as part of America's research in atomic and nuclear weapons safety, responsibility, and reliability—to go there and see a ghost town as you drive the streets, with smoke on one side, fire on one side, a house burned down, your heart kind of goes out. A great deal of empathy pours from you.

We are very lucky, the Senate should know; even though over 44,000 acres have burned, something like 400 housing units have burned to the ground, and upwards of 25,000 people have been evacuated—many are returning now. Damage and fire are still going in some of the canyons—but, we are very grateful that in the canyons that are still burning there are not very many housing units in the path. The forest is still burning and will burn for a long time. Yet nobody died, nobody got seriously hurt. Two or three firemen were injured, as I understand it, and none of those was serious.

The fire is now no longer threatening the houses of the city of Los Alamos or of White Rock, the adjoining community. In some very miraculous way, none of the big administrative and research buildings of the laboratory was hit by this fire. It went around them and got some housing subdivisions, but only a few buildings of minor significance that are part of this enormous science complex were burned.

The houses that burned, burned right to the ground. All that is left is cement foundations, as Senator BINGAMAN will describe and perhaps show some pictures. If there were houses that had cars in the front yards, the cars were burned to a crisp. The metal is twisted and burned. In some places, you can see an icebox that is hanging over the vacuum that used to be sheltered by walls and roofs. The icebox just melted. It is no longer even noticeable. You cannot recognize it as being such. It is melted and completely different in form.

Essentially, all this was going on right around and close to a laboratory that does an awful lot of nuclear work, that has some compounds that are housed in cement bunkers so nothing can happen to them. And, sure enough, to this day there has been no radioactivity escape from any of these buildings and/or research facilities.

That is not just the Federal Government saying it. The New Mexico environmental department has monitored this. The greatest and best monitors from around the country are located there, and the ambient air monitors have indicated there is no radioactivity in the air. So now we have to start back up the path of trying to see how we can rebuild the lives of people there.

I am not going to go into detail other than to say we are beginning to move in the right direction. The laboratory personnel will begin to move in and see what is needed. In one of the communities, people are coming back. Parts of Los Alamos will be reoccupied soon. But I am sure Senator BINGAMAN and I will be asking the Senate, from time to time, to assist us, either with legislation that will direct how this should be handled, or certainly with money that will make the repairs and bring this facility back to where maybe we could say we will make it as whole as possible.

I want to close my first few remarks, and then yield to my friend, Senator BINGAMAN, by saying that right next to this forest, which surrounds Los Alamos, the Los Alamos property that belongs to the Department of Energy, is a national monument called Bandelier. It is rather renowned.

Both Senator BINGAMAN and I have had reason to work specifically for things to preserve and make the Bandelier National Monument a great and beautiful place. But it appears that in order to clear out that Bandelier forest a bit, because so much growth had accumulated and because of so many fallen trees and other things, that a planned burn took place. It looks as if